

Appl. No 10/728,596
Amdt. dated April 12, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 29, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 22, 24, and 27-37 are currently pending in the current application. With this response, claims 1-27 and claims 33-37 are canceled. No new claims are added.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 22, 24, and 27-37 of the above referenced application based upon the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory double patenting. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's argument on the grounds that the amended claims do not qualify as an obvious modification of co pending Application No. 10/728,689.

The Examiner stated that "Claims 22, 24, and 27-37 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 28-26, and 40-43 of copending Application No. 10/728,689. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the Claim 35 of the instant application and claim 29 of the copending application 10/728,689 are very similar."

"The instant application claiming the images received from the computer to be displayed on the display and the copending application claiming a first and a second displays to display the images from the computer. However, the limitation that matters in above is not the number of displays, but the numbers of images to be displayed which is received from the computer."

"Both applications shows the a performance status display."

The claims of the current application have been modified to remove the claims claiming the performance status display. These claims have been incorporated in the co-pending application. Additionally, the current claims of the instant application contain a limitation of a switching device. The switching device allows a single image display device to switch between two separate images. Since the switching device is neither taught, suggested, nor implied by the claims of the co-pending application, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the double-patenting rejection is no longer valid. Therefore, since MPEP §2143.03 requires that "To establish

Appl. No 10/728,596
Amdt. dated April 12, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 29, 2005

prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art," for at least the reasons shown, the Examiner has not met his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness between this application and the other cited applications.

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner has any suggestions or comments for further placing the instant application in a condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned with the same. Otherwise, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Daryl R. Wright, Reg. No. 53,794
Customer No. 43,682
Adachi International Patent Firm
Nagoyaseni Bldg. 7F,
9-27, Nishiki, 2-Chome,
Naka-ku, Nagoya-shi, Aichi
Japan, 460-0003
Tel: +81-52-203-1001
Fax: +81-52-231-0515
E-mail: wright@patent.gr.jp